

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in view of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

After entry of the present amendment, Claims 1 and 3-27 are pending in the present application; and Claims 5-7, 10, 13, 14, 16-18, 21, and 26 are withdrawn from consideration without prejudice or disclaimer. The present amendment amends Claim 1; and cancels Claim 2 without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 22-25, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph; and Claims 1, 3, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5, 419, 547 to Jeong.

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 22-25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

The outstanding Office Action states:

Regarding the independent Claims 1, 4, 15, 24, and 25 and their dependent claims, the recited sequences of intervals and drive amounts of the controlled device/control means are confusing. For example, it is unclear how the recited control device/control means can **first** calculate slip **based on information from the detection by the second detecting device**, and **then** set a second drive amount of a drive device/drive means during a second interval that **starts when the second detecting device detects the sheet**. In other words, it is unclear how the recited timing of the slip calculation and the timing of the second interval can occur.¹

The claimed invention provides a first drive amount calculated for a first interval from detection by the first detecting device to detection by the second detecting device; and a second drive amount, which is based on the first drive amount, calculated for a second interval from detection by the second detecting device to a stoppage of the drive device. Thus, the calculation of the second drive amount clearly occurs after determination of the first drive amount. However, such determination of the first drive amount and calculation of

¹ Office Action, 7/20/2005, page 2 (original emphasis).

the second drive amount may both occur at the transition from the first interval to the second interval, with some variation in view of design considerations and/or technical limitations, e.g., awaiting calculation of the first drive amount.

Accordingly, for the above stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 22-25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Jeong, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is overcome by the amendment of independent Claims 1 and 24 to recite the subject matter of Claim 2, which is not rejected over Jeong in the Office Action.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Philip Hoffmann
Registration No. 46,340